



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,101	12/20/2001	Clifford Lee Hannel	intdyn01.021	8647

7590
Gordon E Nelson
57 Central Street
PO Box 782
Rowley, MA 01969

09/02/2005

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
OIPE/IAP

SEP 13 2005

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/019,101

Applicant(s)

HANNEL ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

RD

Claim Status

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1-14 are rejected as detailed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,504,890 issued to Sanford (hereafter Sanford).

Claim 1:

Sanford discloses:

a virtual database service [col 6, lines 6-10]

an information source for the information to be provided [flat file view, col 3, lines 13-35],
the virtual database service receiving the query, responding to the field name and the indication
of the manner of selecting a row as required to obtain the information to be provided from the
information source [contributor-specific subset of data fields, col 2, lines 24-38], and providing
the information as the value of the field indicated by the field name in the selected row, whereby
the apparatus presents the virtual database table to a source of the query [Fig 1, col 5, lines 44-
60, col 5, line 60 through col 6, line 15].

Claim 2:

Art Unit: 2161

Sanford discloses a manner of selecting a row includes a selection value; and the information source provides a component of the information to be provided in response to a match between the selection value and a pattern that matches a plurality of values and is accessible to the information source [viewing prioritization rule set, col 1, line 62]

Claim 4:

Sanford discloses the information source is an access evaluator which determines whether a user may have access to an information resource; the manner of selecting the row includes information from which the user and the information resource may be determined; and the provided information includes an indication of whether the user determined from the information may access the information resource determined therefrom [Fig 8, col 12, lines 4-16].

Claim 5:

Sanford discloses the access evaluator determines whether the user may have access to the information resource by considering one or more access policies, each access policy indicating whether a user group may have access to a set of information resources and access by the user to the information resource being allowed when the access policies for the user groups to which the user belongs and the sets of information resources to which the information resource belongs so indicate; and the manner of selecting the row contains membership information about the user from which membership of the user in a user group may be determined [collaboration amongst contributors, col 2, lines 11-23].

Claim 6:

Art Unit: 2161

Sanford discloses the access evaluator uses the membership information to determine membership of the user in a user group [Fig 8, col 12, lines 4-16].

Claim 7:

Sanford discloses the access evaluator determines that there may be a user group such that membership in the user group would give the user access to the information resource; and the provided information indicates a method of providing further information about the user in a further query from which the user's membership in the user group can be determined [collaboration identification, col 7, lines 20-23].

Claim 8:

Sanford discloses the further information includes authentication information which may be used to validate the user's identity [[collaboration identity, col 7, lines 20-23].

Claim 9:

Sanford discloses an additional information source that is an authenticator, the authenticator using the authentication information to validate the user's identity [another collaboration identification, col 12, lines 35-41].

Claim 10:

Sanford discloses the response to the further query provides an indication whether the user's identity is valid [Fig 8, col 12, lines 4-17].

Claim 12:

Sanford discloses an additional information source that is an authenticator which validates the identity of the user; the authenticator uses the membership information to validate the identity of the user; the access evaluator determines membership of the user in a user group

Art Unit: 2161

only after the authenticator has validated the user's identity [Fig 4, 125 collaboration number, col 7, lines 15-20].

Claim 13:

Sanford discloses an additional information source that is an authenticator which validates an identity of the user; the manner of selecting the row includes authentication information which the authenticator uses to validate the user's identity; and the provided information is obtained at least in part from the authenticator and includes an indication of whether the user's identity is valid [Fig 4, 125 collaboration number, col 7, lines 15-20].

Claim 14:

Sanford discloses an additional information source that is a user profile information source which provides additional information about the user; the manner of selecting the row includes profile information gathering information which indicates to the profile information source how to gather the profile information; and the provided information is obtained at least in part from the profile information source and includes the profile information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

Art Unit: 2161

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford in view of The Coldfusion 4.0 Web Application Construction Kit, Third Edition by Ben Forta, Nate Weiss, Michael Dinowitz, Ashley King and Davis Crawford (hereafter Forta), Published December 23, 1998.

Claim 3:

Sanford discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Sanford fails to disclose wherein the query is an SQL query addressing the database table; the field name is contained in a SELECT clause in the query; and the indication of the manner of selecting a row is contained in a WHERE clause in the query.

Forta discloses wherein the query is an SQL query addressing the database table; the field name is contained in a SELECT clause in the query; and the indication of the manner of selecting a row is contained in a WHERE clause in the query [Listing 8.6 and Fig 8.20].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sanford to include wherein the query is an SQL query addressing the database table; the field name is contained in a SELECT clause in the query; and the indication of the manner of selecting a row is contained in a WHERE clause in the query as taught by Forta.

Art Unit: 2161

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Sanford per the above for the purpose of selecting a table and filtering out the rows which are not of interest.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanford in view of US Pat No 5,748,890 issued to Goldberg et al (hereafter Goldberg).

Claim 11:

Sanford discloses the elements of claims 1, 4 and 5 as noted above.

Sanford fails to disclose an additional information source that is a user profile information source which provides additional information about the user; the information about the user includes a user information retrieval method specification that specifies how the user profile: information source provides the additional information; and the access evaluator uses at least some of the additional information to determine membership of the user in the user group.

Goldberg discloses an additional information source that is a user profile information source which provides additional information about the user; the information about the user includes a user information retrieval method specification that specifies how the user profile: information source provides the additional information; and the access evaluator uses at least some of the additional information to determine membership of the user in the user group [user's role, claim 3].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sanford to include an additional information source that is a user profile information source which provides additional information about the user; the information about the user includes a user information retrieval method specification that specifies how the user

Art Unit: 2161

profile: information source provides the additional information; and the access evaluator uses at least some of the additional information to determine membership of the user in the user group as taught by Goldberg.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Sanford per the above for the purpose of providing additional means of authenticating a user within a user's group.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the first paragraph on page 11 "Versions of Sanford's system which employ combined data 111 do not, of course, involve a virtual database table, since combined database 111 is a real database."

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. MPEP § 2106 requires Office personnel to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed Cir. 1997). Applicant discloses the following in the first paragraph of page 99 with reference to Figure 54:

Virtual relational database table 5411 does not really exist, but appears to exist to the applications that make queries on it. From the applicant's point of view application, virtual relational database table 5411 works exactly like a real relational database table 5411.

Art Unit: 2161

Examiner maintains that applicant has not clearly defined the difference between a virtual relational database table and a real relational database table since above excerpt from applicant's specification discloses that from a query point of view, a virtual relational database works exactly like a real relational database.

Considering the disclosure of Sanford per column 6, lines 5-15:

The collaboration between contributors 11, 13, and 15 may result in the creation of a collaboration entity, but this is not necessary since the present invention allows for the creation of a virtual database from the data contained in database 17, 25 and 33. If an actual collaborative entity is formed, workstations 43, 45, 47 and 49 would be useful, but if no collaborative entity is formed, and if the combined database is in fact a virtual database, or if multiple copies of virtual databases are not maintained workstations 43, 45, 47 and 49 are not needed.

Furthermore, Sanford discloses in column 5, lines 63-68:

Server 41 is provided for performing the data sharing functions of the present invention. Server 41 typically includes a data processing system, and communicates with databases 17, 25, 31 as well as the workstations associated therewith through data bus 51, in accordance with conventional networking technologies.

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the disclosure of Sanford matches that of applicant. Sanford discloses that the virtual database acts like a real database because contributor workstations can access databases 17, 25 and 33 in the same manner as the virtual database which is a combination of database 17, 25 and 33.

Applicant Argues:

Applicant states in the last paragraph of page 11 "As is clear from this description, a rule operates to select one variant of the information contained in a particular data field over other variants, not to determining a 'match between the selection value and a pattern that matches a plurality of values' as required by claim 2."

Art Unit: 2161

Examiner Responds:

Examiner is not persuaded. MPEP § 2106 requires Office personnel to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed Cir. 1997).

Returning now to FIG. 3, the contributing entities should collaborate in determining which particular fields in combined database 11 will be available for searching. Those decisions should be embodied in search routine 115. As is identified in FIG. 4, each data element (or associated group of data elements) is identified with an identification block, which includes a plurality of data fields which provide an indication of the origin of the data, the source of the data, the date of acquisition of the data, and some relative rank of the confidence in the data. Since each data element or group of data elements includes an identification block, it is sensible to allow the searching of one or more of these fields. A more difficult determination to be made is whether fields which are uniquely associated with a particular contributors are to be made available for searching. If they are made available, the searching protocols can become complicated. In the preferred embodiment in the present invention, the search routines should be restricted to either the collaboration identification, the name of the monitored-entity, or the social security number of the monitored-entity, since these fields will typically be associated with most of the significant data items in the combined database 111.

Examiner maintains above disclosure by Sanford of searching protocols reads on the claim 2 limitation "match between the selection value and a pattern that matches a plurality of values."

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2161

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Etienne LeRoux

August 29, 2005

NEW CENTRAL FAX NUMBER

Effective July 15, 2005

On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to **571-273-8300**. This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number. To give customers time to adjust to the new Central FAX Number, faxes sent to the old number (703-872-9306) will be routed to the new number until September 15, 2005.

After September 15, 2005, the old number will no longer be in service and **571-273-8300** will be the only facsimile number recognized for “centralized delivery”.

CENTRALIZED DELIVERY POLICY: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the Central FAX number, unless an exception applies. For example, if the examiner has rejected claims in a regular U.S. patent application, and the reply to the examiner's Office action is desired to be transmitted by facsimile rather than mailed, the reply must be sent to the Central FAX Number.

TC2100 RANDOLPH

Organization Bldg./Room

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. BOX 1450

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

